REMARKS

Claims 1-6, 15-20, 25, and 26 are in the case.

Applicant gratefully acknowledges the Examiner's allowance of Claims 1-6 and 15-20.

Applicant gratefully acknowledges the Examiner's allowance of Claims 9 and 11 if rewritten as independent claims including the limitations of any intervening claim.

New Claims 25 and 26 have been added to more particularly point out and distinctly claim that which Applicant regards as his invention to present Claims 9 and 11 as independent claims in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Claim 10 has been amended to correct an obvious and inadvertent typographical error to recite an aperture in step (a).

The formal Abstract has been amended in accordance with the Examiner's suggestions to delete "novel" throughout, delete "and characterized....integrity features," and to delete "then" and insert therefore "than."

Drawings

Applicant gratefully acknowledges the Examiner's formal acceptance of the formal drawings.

ABSTRACT

The Abstract of the disclosure stands objected to because the Examiner takes the position that it refers to purported merits of the invention and compares the invention with the prior art. Correction is required.

The formal Abstract has been amended in accordance with the Examiner's suggestions to delete "novel" throughout, to delete "and characterized....integrity features," and to delete "then" and insert therefore "than."

For the foregoing reasons, the objection to the Abstract is believed to have been overcome by the amendments to the Abstract, and the objection is respectfully requested to be withdrawn.

Claims 7, 8, 9, 10, 11-14, 21, 23, and 24 have been cancelled without prejudice.

CLAIM OBJECTIONS

Claim 10 stands objected to because of an informality of a minor grammatical error. On line 1, Applicant has changed the language to read —through an aperture--.

Claim 10 has been amended to recite an aperture and correct the obvious and inadvertent minor grammatical error.

For the foregoing reasons, the objection to Claim 10 is believed to have been overcome by the Amendment to Claim 10 and is respectfully requested to be withdrawn.

35 U.S.C. 102(e)

Claims 7, 8, 10, 21, 23, and 24 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as anticipated by Robertson, Jr. et al. U.S. Patent No. 6,682,268 (hereinafter "Robertson").

Claims 7, 8, 10, 21, 23, and 24 have been cancelled without prejudice.

For the foregoing reasons, the rejection of Claims 1-3, 7, 8, and 10 under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as anticipated by Robertson, Jr. et al. U.S. Patent No. 6,682,268 (hereinafter "Robertson") is respectfully requested to be withdrawn.

35 U.S.C. 103(a)

Claims 12 through 14 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rubenacker (U.S. Patent No. 6,282,857 Bl) in view of Robertson, Jr. et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,682,268 B2).

Claims 12-14 have been cancelled without prejudice.

For the foregoing reasons, the rejection of Claims 12-14 under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as anticipated by Robertson, Jr. et al.

U.S. Patent No. 6,682,268 (hereinafter "Robertson") is respectfully requested to be withdrawn.

ALLOWABLE SUBJECT MATTER

Claims 9 and 11 stand objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but the Examiner has determined that Claims 9 and 11 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Claims 9 and 11 have been cancelled and presented as new Claims 25 and 26 to more particularly point out and distinctly claim that which Applicant regards as his invention so that Claims 9 and 11 may be rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

For the foregoing reasons, the objection to Claims 9 and 11 is believed to have been overcome by the cancellation of Claims 9 and 11 and the presentation of new Claims 25 and 26 and the objection is respectfully requested to be withdrawn.

Applicant's invention as claimed, as amended, provides in one aspect an apparatus for providing a primary, approved, roof control support system in an underground mine, incorporating in combination a round or oval shaped dome-shaped bearing plate for

contacting, supporting, and compressing a roof in an underground mine; a center aperture in the bearing plate for receiving the roof bolt when installed in the mine roof; apertures on the bearing plate for hanging cables and wires and "J" hooks; recessed center on the bearing plate to aid in concealing the head of the roof bolt when installed in the mine roof and causing a lock washer effect on the roof bolt; and a center recessed area on the bearing plate adapted to cause the outside rim to contact the roof first and then compress the roof at a 30 to 45 degree angle, which is nowhere shown, taught, or even suggested in the prior art cited as the basis for rejection.

Applicant's invention as claimed, as amended, provides in one aspect a method for positioning a roof bolting machine in an area to be secured or bolted in an underground mine; drilling a hole into a mine roof through an immediate roof into an upper strata to a specified depth deeper than the length of the roof bolt being used; inserting a plastic tube of epoxy resin and hardener into the drilled hole; inserting a roof bolt through a aperture of the roof bolt plate; centering the bolt head in a drill machines rotation head; applying upward pressure and rotation as the bolt is pushed into the drilled hole in the roof, breaking the tube of epoxy resin and mixing the resin and hardener together and forcing the mixture into any cracks or separa-

tions in the strata; and subsequently after the plate and bolt head reach within about an inch of the roof, stopping the upward pressure and remaining spinning, stopping the spinning motion and applying the full upward pressure of the bolting machine to push the roof bolt and center of the plate to compress the immediate roof, subsequently lowering the a second or two the bolter head and observing the quality of installation by noticing the lock washer effect on the head of the bolt, and optionally observing whether the bolt head lowers with bolting machine, such that the installed bolt has lost its anchorage, then installing another bolt to replace the failed one, if necessary, and moving to the next area in the underground mine to be secured, which procedure can take less than one minute from start to finish, providing an approved, primary roof support system in an underground mine, which is nowhere shown, taught, or even suggested in the prior art cited as the basis for rejection.

Formal acceptance of the formal drawings is acknowledged.

As allowable subject matter has been indicated, Applicant's reply in the instant Amendment is believed to comply with all formal requirements in accordance specifically with the Examiner's suggestions.

A formal Notice of Allowance to Claims 1-6, 15-20, and 25 (rewritten Claim 9) and Claim 26 (rewritten claim 11) further to

Reconsideration of this application is requested.

Respectfully submitted,

April <u>6</u>, 2005

Douglas G. Glantz Attorney At Law 5260 Deborah Court Doylestown, PA 18901-1949

Voice: (215) 794-9775 Fax: (215) 794-8860

DGG/mnr